

1 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
2 Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
3 Chris Carson, Esq., SBN 280048  
4 Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082  
5 Mail: PO Box 262490  
6 San Diego, CA 92196-2490  
7 Delivery: 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300  
8 San Diego, CA 92131  
9 (858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
10 amandas@potterhandy.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff

12

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 **Samuel Love,**

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 **Tifanny Le;**  
**Buu T. Du;**

19 **El Tazumal Restaurant**, a  
California Corporation; and Does 1-  
10,

20 Defendants.

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For Violations  
Of:** American's With Disabilities  
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act

21 Plaintiff Samuel Love complains of Tifanny Le; Buu T. Du; El Tazumal  
22 Restaurant, a California Corporation; and Does 1-10 ("Defendants"), and  
23 alleges as follows:

24

25 **PARTIES:**

26 1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is  
27 substantially limited in his ability to walk. He is a paraplegic who uses a  
28 wheelchair for mobility.

1       2. Defendants Tifanny Le and Buu T. Du owned the real property located  
2 at or about 14621 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, California, in March 2019.

3       3. Defendants Tifanny Le and Buu T. Du own the real property located at  
4 or about 14621 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, California, currently.

5       4. Defendant El Tazumal Restaurant owned Restaurante El Tazumal  
6 located at or about 14621 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, California, in March  
7 2019.

8       5. Defendant El Tazumal Restaurant owns Restaurante El Tazumal  
9 (“Restaurant”) located at or about 14621 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo,  
10 California, currently.

11      6. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
12 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
13 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
14 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
15 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein,  
16 including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the  
17 events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief.  
18 Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities,  
19 connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10,  
20 inclusive, are ascertained.

21

22      **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

23      7. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28  
24 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
25 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

26      8. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
27 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
28 the same transactions, is also brought under California’s Unruh Civil Rights

1 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

2 9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) and is  
3 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is  
4 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.  
5

6 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

7 10. Plaintiff went to the Restaurant in March 2019 with the intention to  
8 avail himself of its goods or services and to assess the business for compliance  
9 with the disability access laws.

10 11. The Restaurant is a facility open to the public, a place of public  
11 accommodation, and a business establishment.

12 12. Parking spaces are one of the facilities, privileges, and advantages  
13 offered by Defendants to patrons of the Restaurant.

14 13. Unfortunately, on the date of the plaintiff's visit, the defendants did not  
15 provide accessible parking in conformance with the ADA Standards.

16 14. Currently, the defendants do not provide accessible parking in  
17 conformance with the ADA Standards.

18 15. Plaintiff personally encountered this barrier.

19 16. By failing to provide accessible parking, the defendants denied the  
20 plaintiff full and equal access.

21 17. The lack of accessible parking created difficulty and discomfort for the  
22 Plaintiff.

23 18. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
24 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with  
25 disabilities.

26 19. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much  
27 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the  
28 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,

1 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous  
2 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of  
3 access if complete removal were not achievable.

4 20. Plaintiff will return to the Restaurant to avail himself of goods or  
5 services and to determine compliance with the disability access laws once it is  
6 represented to him that the Restaurant and its facilities are accessible. Plaintiff  
7 is currently deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the existing  
8 barriers and his uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers on the  
9 site. If the barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and  
10 discriminatory barriers again.

11 21. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations  
12 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are  
13 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will  
14 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this  
15 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that  
16 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See  
17 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff  
18 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his  
19 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

20

21 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS  
22 WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all  
23 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

24 22. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
25 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
26 complaint.

27 23. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the  
28 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any

1 place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone  
2 who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.  
3 § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- 4 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,  
5 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford  
6 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
7 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the  
8 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those  
9 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 10 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is  
11 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are  
12 defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- 13 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the  
14 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are  
15 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,  
16 including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the  
17 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and  
18 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the  
19 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals  
20 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

21 24. When a business provides parking for its customers, it must provide  
22 accessible parking in compliance with the ADA Standards.

23 25. Here, the lack of accessible parking in compliance with the ADA  
24 Standards is a violation of the law.

25 26. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable  
26 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the  
27 1991 Standards.

28 27. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition

1 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily  
2 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

3 28. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available  
4 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

5

6 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**  
7 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.  
8 Code § 51-53.)

9 29. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
10 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
11 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,  
12 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,  
13 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of  
14 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.  
15 Civ. Code § 51(b).

16 30. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the  
17 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

18 31. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the  
19 Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s  
20 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,  
21 privileges, or services offered.

22 32. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,  
23 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
24 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-  
25 (c).)

1           **PRAYER:**

2           Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
3 relief as follows:

4           1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
5 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
6 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
7 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

8           2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
9 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

10          3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
11 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

12

13 Dated: April 3, 2019

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

14

15 By: 

16

17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 Amanda Seabock, Esq.  
Attorney for plaintiff